

REMARKS

Applicant submits that the response filed October 20, 2004 addressed all of the outstanding rejections. However, please consider the following supplementation in conjunction with the amendments and remarks contained in the response filed October 20, 2004.

As the response filed October 20, 2004 was in reply to a nonfinal Office Action, Applicants assume that the amendments and new claims indicated in the response filed October 20, 2004 have been entered. Accordingly, claims 2-3, 6, 8-12, 15, 46-48, 50, 76-83, 85-94, and 96-104 are pending in the application, and amendments indicated herein have been shown relative to the claims as amended in the response filed October 20, 2004.

Claim 87 has been cancelled herein without prejudice or disclaimer of the subject matter claimed therein. Claim 87 has been rewritten for purposes of clarity as new claim 105, which depends from claim 47. Support for new claim 105 is the same as for previous claim 87, including, *inter alia*, original claim 4, in the specification at page 17, lines 18-31 and throughout the specification. Claims 88, 90-93, 96-97, and 103-104 have accordingly been amended to correct claim dependency. Claim 76 has been amended for clarity. These amendments have been made for purposes of clarity and do not change the scope of the claims. Accordingly, no new matter has been added by these amendments.

After entry of these amendments, claims 2-3, 6, 8-12, 15, 46-48, 50, 76-83, 85-86, 88-94, and 96-105 will be pending in the application.

Rewriting claim 87 as new claim 105 affects some of the arguments made regarding claim 87 in the response filed October 20, 2004. However, Applicant submits that all rejections of claim 87 (rewritten as new claim 105) and claims dependent thereon have been previously addressed or are currently addressed.

1. Second rejection of claims 2, 3, 6, 8-13, 15, 46-48, 50, and 76-99 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

Claims 2, 3, 6, 8-13, 15, 46-48, 50, and 76-99 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite in their recitation of “the neural precursor cells having the ability to differentiate into neuronal cells, glial cells, or combinations thereof” because it is allegedly unclear if the precursor cells have the ability to differentiate into all three cell types, including neurons, astrocytes, and oligodendrocytes, or if the precursors only have the ability to differentiate into either neuronal cells or glial cells. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection in part.

Claims 13, 84, and 95 were cancelled in the response filed October 20, 2004 without prejudice or disclaimer of the subject matter contained therein. Accordingly, Applicant submits that this rejection is moot with regard to these claims.

Claim 87 has been cancelled herein without prejudice or disclaimer of the subject matter contained therein and rewritten as new claim 105. Although Applicant submits that this rejection is now moot with regard to claim 87, Applicant submits that this rejection as applied to claim 87 is addressed herein.

With regard to the remaining rejected claims, Applicant provides the following remarks. As discussed in the response filed October 20, 2004, claims 2, 8, 47, and 76 were amended to remove the phrase “or combinations thereof.” Furthermore, as discussed in the response filed October 20, 2004 and as discussed with the Examiner during the telephonic interview on October 14, 2004, the neural precursor cells have the ability to generate mature neural cells, *i.e.*, glial or neuronal cells, and the cell compositions of the presently claimed embodiments of the invention may contain neural precursor cells, neuronal cells, glial cells or combinations thereof. Additionally, the specification defines “neural precursor” as an “[i]mmature cell of the nervous system which has the potential to develop into mature nervous system cells such as neurons and glia (astrocytes and oligodendrocytes).” (See specification, page 7, lines 15-17) Thus, Applicant submits that the language in claims 2, 47, 76 (and those claims

dependent thereon) is definite and indicates that the neural precursor cells are not committed cells but could develop into a neuronal cell or a glial cell.

Therefore, Applicant submits that the claims as amended are definite, and accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that this § 112, second paragraph, rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

CONCLUSIONS

In view of the arguments and amendments set forth above, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and reexamination of the above-referenced patent application. Applicant submits that the rejections contained in the Office Action mailed on April 21, 2004 have been overcome, and that the claims are in condition for allowance.

No fees are believed to be due in connection with this response. However, please charge any underpayments or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 08-0219.

If the Examiner has any questions or amendments that she would like to discuss with the Applicant, she is encouraged to call the undersigned at the number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,



Ann-Louise Kerner, Ph.D.
Reg. No. 33,523

Date: February 10, 2005
WILMER CUTLER PICKERING
HALE AND DORR LLP
60 State Street
Boston, MA 02109
Tel: (617) 526-6000
Fax: (617) 526-5000